

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/622,445	07/21/2003	Alan Gene Phillips	54525.000102	5232
21967	7590 10/12/2005		EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP			PETERSON, KENNETH E	
INTELLECT	'UAL PROPERTY DEPAR'	TMENT		
1900 K STRI	EET, N.W.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 1200			3724	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			TY			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/622,445	PHILLIPS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenneth E. Peterson	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addre	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire  fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comm ID (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Au	igust 2005.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	·		erits is			
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) Claim(s) 2-12 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Clalm(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2 and 4-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1	l.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-	152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Sta	ge			
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draffsperson's Patent Drawing Review (RTO 948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	·				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-15)	2)			

Art Unit: 3724

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 2,4,6,8,9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Popik et al.'089, who shows a fixed bearing (545), a reciprocating shaft (540,546) as best seen in figure 8. Popik also shows a front bearing near numeral 400a in figure 8.

The inner bearing surface of the shaft is intrinsically spaced radially further out than the outer surface of the fixed bearing. It is well understood in industry that there need be some small gap between the two surfaces in order to compensate for manufacturing tolerances and to prevent binding.

3. Claims 2,4,6,8,9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Banion '443, who shows a fixed bearing (20), a reciprocating shaft (4.5) as best seen in figure 2. O'Banion also shows a front bearing (33).

The inner bearing surface of the shaft is intrinsically spaced radially further out than the outer surface of the fixed bearing. It is well understood in industry that there need be some small gap between the two surfaces in order to compensate for manufacturing tolerances and to prevent binding.

Application/Control Number: 10/622,445

Art Unit: 3724

4. Claims 2,4-6,8 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forseberg '737, who shows a threaded fixed bearing (46), a reciprocating shaft (51,43) as best seen in figures 2 and 3. Forseburg also shows a front bearing (52).

The inner bearing surface of the shaft is intrinsically spaced radially further out than the outer surface of the fixed bearing. It is well understood in industry that there need be some small gap between the two surfaces in order to compensate for manufacturing tolerances and to prevent binding.

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popik or O'Banion as set forth above.

Neither Popik nor O'Banion have a pivotable drive shaft as claimed. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known for saws of this type to be structured so that the whole forward housing is pivotable along with the drive shaft to change the angle of the blade. An example of this is the patent to Schmitz '364.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified either Popik or O'Banion by making their forward housings and drive shafts pivot

Art Unit: 3724

relative to the remainder of the saw, as is well known and taught by Schmitz, in order to be able to angle the saw blade and make cuts that would otherwise be too difficult.

- 7. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3724

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp October 5, 2005

> KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER